

Polish "Leta" for the river "Lethe" is left unchanged in the English text. The translators see no difference between "zapach" (scent) and "węch" (sense of smell) and therefore render the line "Jak oddać zapach w poezji" (p. 52) as "How to present the sense of smell in poetry" rather than "How to convey scent in poetry."

The book has many typographical errors. A few that wreak havoc with the meaning include the last word of the line "a distant color swells" which should read "smells" (p. 16); the last word in "the ability to converse" should read "conserve" (p. 27); the word "moon" in the first line of "Summer" should be replaced by "noon" (p. 67).

Other deficiencies that should be mentioned are: literal translations of idioms which are meaningless in English, the dubious procedure of resorting to explanatory footnotes (see p. 97), and inept translation of metaphors, for example, "biała ryba ciała" (p. 95) or "the body's white fish" becomes the "realistic" phrase "the white fish's body," and in "from the burning airplane of your brain," the metaphoric "airplane" is, without apparent reason, prosaically translated as "surface."

Although some poems are free of glaring errors, the translators show a lack of linguistic sophistication and poetic sensitivity. Faring the worst are Wisława Szymborska, a great master of ellipsis and concision, and the fine poet of the younger generation, Ewa Lipska, who often constructs her poems around a single sustained metaphor. The skimpy biographical and critical notes are often inexact and misleading; however, space limitations preclude listing examples.

Those who subscribe to the philosophy that bad translations are better than no translations at all will find this anthology useful. With the inclusion of poems by Hillar, Iredyński, and Poświatowska, this collection introduces several previously untranslated poets and provides a glimpse into some of the themes of Polish poetry of the last twenty years. In defense of the Polish translators who probably have not spent a protracted length of time in English-speaking countries, it should be noted that they have selected the poems well and provided comprehensible first drafts which editors more familiar with Polish language, culture, and poetry could have turned into acceptable English versions.

Pittsburgh University Press deserves qualified praise for incurring the expense of an attractive bilingual edition.

MAGNUS JAN KRYNSKI  
Duke University

SERBIAN POETRY AND MILUTIN BOJIĆ. By *Mihailo Đorđević*. East European Monographs, 34. Boulder, Colo.: *East European Quarterly*, 1977. vi, 113 pp. Illus. Glossary. \$10.00. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York.

Considering the deplorable scarcity of full-length monographs in English dealing with Serbian and other Yugoslav authors, Mihailo Đorđević's book on Milutin Bojić (1892-1917) is a welcome contribution to the field of Serbian studies in America. Its publication must be greeted with joy and with the hope that more works of this genre will follow. A five-chapter study on the life and work of Bojić (pp. 1-82) and twenty-six translations of his most representative lyric poems (pp. 83-96) constitute the major parts of this book. They are followed by an impressive bibliography (pp. 97-100) including over eighty entries on Bojić and a glossary (pp. 101-13) of one hundred forty-nine important names, titles, places, and events mentioned in the book, which was compiled by Jelisaveta Stanojevich-Allen. The glossary provides a wealth of useful information both for readers unfamiliar with the political and cultural scene in Serbia prior to World War I, and for students who lack a broader background in European literatures.

Bojić the poet emerges in a new light in this study. Đorđević successfully presents evidence to counter the traditional evaluation of Bojić as a poet who lacks inner depth and is “nothing but one of the small” Serbian poets. The author justifiably considers Bojić one of the great Serbian poets of the twentieth century. He points out that there is a considerable difference in inspiration and tone between the early, youthful, passionate poems of Bojić and the later ones, written after the poet had experienced the horrors of the First World War and the ordeals of the Albanian exodus. As a carefree youth, bubbling with energy and earthy passion, Bojić was a sensual poet, in love with life and all women. After 1914, Bojić matured rapidly into “a spiritual, almost humble” poet, in love with only one woman, and a sincere patriot, identifying his personal suffering with the anguish of his crucified nation. Đorđević sensitively presents Bojić’s life and poetry as symbolizing, in some way, the fate of early twentieth-century Serbia. It is somewhat disturbing, however, that the author did not find it necessary to express his own views on the book, *Život i književni rad Milutina Bojića* (1969) by Gavriilo Kovijanić, especially since the book is cited in the bibliography.

Although Đorđević’s reevaluation of Bojić is well argued and convincing, and the majority of the translations of Bojić’s poems are very successful, one aspect of the volume under review must be mentioned with regret, if for no other reason than to prevent similar occurrences in the future. The editorial work on this volume is astonishingly poor, and it prevents the annoyed reader from fully appreciating the author’s ideas. One wonders whether the publisher even had the text proofread for obvious misprints before releasing the book. This defect is quite apart from other technical inconsistencies and textual problems for which authors should be able to rely on their editors. In addition to many examples of *ć*, *č*, *š*, and *ž* with omitted diacritics, the book abounds with misprints such as “tehir” for their and “introudce” instead of introduce (both on p. 11), “elgaic” for elegiac (pp. 11 and 40), “torpoed” for torpedoed (p. 14), “bladau” in place of the Serbo-Croatian *hladan* (p. 9), “breats” instead of breasts (p. 33), “finsishing” for finishing (p. 23), “ntoice” for notice (p. 64) and so forth. The name Zmaj-Jova Jovanović is misprinted as Jovanić (p. 5), Milosav Jelić appears also as Milutin (p. vi) and as Miloslav (p. 13), and “Smrt majke Jugovića” is found as “Smrt Majke Jurovića” and “Smrt Majke Jogovica” (in the same footnote 9, on pp. 19 and 20, which is also entirely misprinted). The French and Latin titles are printed according to French and Latin usage, but all the Serbian titles (which in Serbo-Croatian follow the Latin/French pattern) are printed according to English usage. Titles of individual poems are generally in italics as are the titles of books quoted. Moreover, bibliographical references such as *Beograd*, *knjiga*, *sveska*, and *godina* should not appear in a book printed in English. More conscientious editors would have spotted such inconsistencies before the book was published, and they also would have suggested textual changes wherever they were necessary (see, for example, “the house *in* Hilendarska street,” p. 15, “*at* the emotional focus,” p. 31, “He was never an alcoholic, though he enjoyed wine and occasionally used it in his poems to create a particular atmosphere,” p. 30, and many others). A publisher presumably concerned with his reputation should have secured more reliable editors and proofreaders, well acquainted both with English and with East European (including Slavic!) languages.

BILJANA SLJIVIC-SIMSIĆ  
*University of Illinois at Chicago Circle*